

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the non-final Office Action dated May 2, 2008. Claims 2 to 6, 14, 16 to 18, and 22 to 25 have been cancelled, without prejudice or disclaimer of subject matter. Claims 1, 7 to 9, and 19 have been amended and claims 26 to 38 have been added. Claims 1, 7 to 13, 15, 19 to 21, and 26 to 38 remain in the application, of which claims 1, 19, and 38 are the independent claims. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Interview Summary

Initially, Applicants' undersigned representative thanks Examiner Pond for the thoughtful courtesies and kind treatment afforded during the telephone interview conducted on July 30, 2008. During the interview, Examiner Pond and Applicants' representative discussed amended independent claim 1 with respect to the cited references. Examiner Pond indicated that the amendments to independent claim 1 appear to overcome the cited references, although further consideration and search are required. This reply reflects the substance of the interview.

Rejections

Claims 1 to 12 and 15 to 25 were rejected over Nowers (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0033205), and claims 13 and 14 were rejected over Nowers in view of Amazon ("Amazon.com Auctions Helps Online Sellers Become Effective Marketers," PR Newswire, 18 Aug 1999, Proquest #44014963, 4pgs). Based on the following remarks and the discussion in the telephone interview of July 30, 2008, withdrawal of the rejections and further examination are respectfully requested.

Referring to particular claim language, independent claim 1, as amended, recites a method comprising, inter alia, developing, using a connection provider computer system and based on information, received from a seller, describing one or more items for sale by the seller, a pricing and listing strategy for selling the one or more items on one or more online sales channels selected, from among multiple potential online sales channels, as being appropriate for selling the one or more items, and using the connection provider computer system to select, from among multiple potential fulfillment centers based on the information describing the one or more

items for sale by the seller, one or more fulfillment centers tailored to fulfilling orders of items having properties in common with the one or more items.

Independent claims 19 and 38, although different in scope from claim 1 and each other, recite features similar to those discussed above with respect to independent claim 1.

Nowers is not seen to disclose, teach or suggest the foregoing features recited by the independent claims. In particular, as discussed in the telephone interview of July 30, 2008, Nowers fails to disclose at least the feature of using a connection provider computer system to select, from among multiple potential fulfillment centers based on information, received from a seller, describing one or more items for sale by the seller, one or more fulfillment centers tailored to fulfilling orders of items having properties in common with the one or more items.

Specifically, Nowers is directed to establishing, at a single physical location, an inventory of products for sale through an electronic storefront. See Nowers at Abstract. Because the Nowers system establishes an inventory of products at a single physical location, the Nowers system does not, and has no reason to, select, from among multiple potential fulfillment centers based on information describing one or more items for sale by a seller, one or more fulfillment centers tailored to fulfilling orders of items having properties in common with the one or more items. Rather, the Nowers system fulfills all orders at the single physical location. Therefore, Nowers fails to describe or suggest at least the feature of using a connection provider computer system to select, from among multiple potential fulfillment centers based on information, received from a seller, describing one or more items for sale by the seller, one or more fulfillment centers tailored to fulfilling orders of items having properties in common with the one or more items.

The other rejected claims and new claims in the application are each dependent on these independent claims and are thus believed to be allowable over the applied references for at least the same reasons. Because each claim is deemed to define additional aspects of the disclosure, however, the individual consideration of each claim on its own merits is respectfully requested.

All of the pending issues have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, objection, issue, or comment, including the Office Action's characterizations of the reference, does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue, or

comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment or cancellation of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment or cancellation. Since the amendments made herein have been made solely in an effort to expedite advancement of this case, the Applicants reserves the right to prosecute the rejected claims in further prosecution of this or related applications.

No other matters being raised, it is believed that the entire application is fully in condition for allowance and such action is courteously solicited.

Please apply any charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 4, 2008

/Jeremy J. Monaldo/

Jeremy J. Monaldo

Reg. No. 58,680

Fish & Richardson P.C.
1425 K Street, N.W.
11th Floor
Washington, DC 20005-3500
Telephone: (202) 783-5070
Facsimile: (202) 783-2331